

REMARKS

Interview

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and assistance during the interview on March 16, 2010.

Applicants will address each of the objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 12 and 13 for informalities therein and suggests a correction to Claims 12 and 13. Therefore, Applicants have amended Claims 12 and 13 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-2 and 12

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-2 and 12 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nishi et al. (US 7,141,817). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the following features:

“a layer having an acceptor level over and in direct contact with the laminated body,

“a layer having a donor level over and in direct contact with the layer having the acceptor level, and

“a second electrode over and in direct contact with the layer having the donor level,

“wherein the layer having an acceptor level comprises both a material with a hole transporting property and a material with an electron accepting property, and

“the layer having a donor level comprises both a material with an electron transporting property and a material with an electron donating property.”

These features are not disclosed or suggested in Nishi. For example, the Examiner contends that in Nishi, the claimed layer having an acceptor level is “electron transporting layer” 235 (i.e. electron transmitting layer in Nishi) and that the claimed layer having a donor level is layer 236 (i.e. electron transmitting region in Nishi).

However, amended Claim 1 recites that the layer having an acceptor level comprises both a material with a hole transporting property and a material with an electron accepting property. As layer 235 in Nishi is an electron transporting layer, layer 235 does not comprises a material with a hole transporting property and does not read on this claimed feature of Claim 1.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Nishi, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Nishi. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6-7, 12-13 and 15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 6-7, 12-13 and 15 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Nishi et al. (US 7,141,817). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

In this rejection, the Examiner again contends that Nishi discloses all the claimed elements of Claim 1 (but applies Fig. 2B in Nishi in a different way).

While Applicants traverse this rejection, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1. These amended features are not disclosed or suggested in Nishi.

For example, in this rejection, the Examiner contends that layer 232 (hole transporting layer) in Nishi corresponds to the claimed layer having an acceptor level and that layer 231 (hole injecting region) in Nishi corresponds to the layer having a donor level of Claim 1.

However, amended Claim 1 recites that the layer having a donor level comprises both a material with an electron transporting property and a material with an electron donating property. As layer 231 is a hole injecting region, layer 231 does not comprise a material with an electron transporting property and does not read on this claimed feature of Claim 1.

In addition, layer 235 (or 236) cannot be held to correspond to the claimed layer having a donor level with layer 231 (or 232) being held to correspond to the claimed layer having an acceptor layer as Claim 1 recites that the layer having a donor level is over and in direct contact with the layer having the acceptor level. Layer 235/236 is not in direct contact with layer 231/232.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Nishi, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Nishi. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 6 to recite the features of:

“a first layer containing a first substance of which a hole mobility is higher than an electron mobility and a second substance that can accept an electron from the first substance over and in direct contact with the laminated body,

“a second layer containing a third substance of which an electron mobility is higher than a hole mobility and a forth substance that can donate an electron to the third substance over and in direct contact with the first layer.”

For similar reasons as explained above for independent Claim 1, Nishi does not disclose or suggest these features of amended Claim 6.

Therefore, independent Claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by Nishi, and Claim 6 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Nishi. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Dated: March 24, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568